

**REPORT OF THE
TASK GROUP TO SURVEY
PCC LIBRARIES ON CATALOGING
OF REMOTE ACCESS ELECTRONIC RESOURCES**

October 17, 2003

Task Group:

Jacqueline Byrd, Indiana University, Bloomington, Chair

Ann Caldwell, Brown University

Ana Cristán, Library of Congress, Ex-officio

Thomas Downing, U.S. G.P.O.

Bruce Knarr, Library of Congress

Margaretta Yarborough, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Report:	
Introduction	5
Amount of Cataloging	6
Categories of Resources Cataloged	6
Criteria for Selection of Resources To Be Cataloged	7
Cataloging Priorities	8
Staff Involved in Cataloging	9
Extent of Cataloging	9
Quality Control	10
Local Customization	10
Availability of Records	11
What's Needed	11
Access Beyond Catalog Records	12
Conclusion	12
Recommendations	13
Appendix A: Survey Respondents	14
Appendix B: Survey And Responses	17

Executive Summary

The charge to the Task Group to Survey PCC Libraries on Cataloging of Remote Access Electronic Resources is:

Develop and conduct a survey of all PCC libraries to determine the extent of current cataloging of remote access electronic resources. The survey should elicit information on the selection criteria and decision process and identify areas where there is a perceived need for more access to be provided.

The final report and survey results are to be submitted in time for the Policy Committee meeting to consider at their 2003 annual meeting and should contain an executive summary with recommendations for further action.

The Task Group created a survey and distributed it widely to both PCC and non-PCC libraries. While some basic trends are identified, the results of the survey suggest that there is a lot of variety in policies and practices with regard to the cataloging of remote electronic resources.

Findings

1. As more and more libraries routinely add and delete large numbers of bibliographic records to their local systems, further investigation is needed on the ramifications of this process on catalog management since systems staff usually performs this process. This approach to handling the large aggregators offers libraries a way to provide records for the many, many electronic journals offered in this manner.
2. Most libraries have local policies for cataloging electronic resources. Some study may be needed to determine how wide-ranging the policies are and how well they conform to national and international standards.
3. Many libraries are still “on the fence” on the single vs. separate record question, with some libraries using a combination of the two. Often the decision is based on what a given library has access to. If both the print and electronic version is available to a library's patrons, then many libraries will choose a single record. Sometimes the source of the record impacts the decision. The decision-making is often situational for this issue.
4. Although some libraries have begun creating bibliographic records with non-MARC metadata, this is not a widespread practice. This is an area to watch in the future, as it is likely to grow.
5. Most libraries do not review e-resources for content change. Obviously this would be a time-consuming process. “Failure to review, however, results in records describing resources that may have changed considerably.”

6. Many libraries use link-checkers and some vendors are beginning to build them into their systems. Many respondents noted the unreliability of these as well as the expense in staff time required to fix broken links.

7. Not all libraries are making their bibliographic records available in one or more of the utilities. It's unclear whether the decision not to contribute these records nationally is economic or a lack of confidence in the records.

8. Respondents would like to see more bibliographic records available in one or more of the utilities.

Because the cataloging of electronic resources is still in development, the group feels that the area should continue to be monitored as technology, practices, and standards develop.

Task Group Report

Introduction

In May 2003 the Task Group to Survey PCC Libraries on Cataloging of Remote Access Electronic Resources was formed. The group charge was:

Develop and conduct a survey of all PCC libraries to determine the extent of current cataloging of remote access electronic resources. The survey should elicit information on the selection criteria and decision process and identify areas where there is a perceived need for more access to be provided.

The members of the Task Group are:

- Jacqueline Byrd, Indiana University, Bloomington, Chair
- Ann Caldwell, Brown University
- Ana Cristán, Library of Congress, Ex-officio
- Thomas Downing, U.S. G.P.O.
- Bruce Knarr, Library of Congress
- Margaretta Yarborough, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Task Group worked through the summer creating, developing, and refining the survey. The final survey was comprised of twenty-five questions. Fifteen of the questions were considered "core" to the charge of the Task Group. Ten were seen as important but peripheral to the charge of the Task Group, and they were listed as "supplemental." Respondents were asked to complete the supplemental questions if they felt that they could spare the time.

On September 12, 2003, the survey was distributed on the PCC, BIBCO, CONSER, and AUTOCAT lists, with a requested return date of Oct. 3, 2003. On September 29th a reminder was sent to these same lists. Respondents could fill out the survey on email, as a WORD document, or as a web form. Most respondents chose the web form.

The Task Group received 88 completed surveys, 35 from BIBCO/CONSER libraries and 53 from non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries. Although most responses were from U.S. Libraries, responses were also received from Canada, the United Kingdom, Hong Kong, and South Africa. Seventy-four of the responding libraries served academic institutions. Others were national libraries, corporate libraries, consortia, and other special libraries. A list of the libraries and other institutions that submitted responses can be found in Appendix A.

The results of the survey exemplify many of the ways in which libraries are similar to one another, as well as the ways in which each is unique. While all have similar basic purposes and most share some basic functions and processes, each approaches serving its unique clientele in its own way. In terms of the current activities and future needs of

cataloging remote electronic resources, the survey results can offer some guidance about what is needed most by the responding libraries.

Appendix B below includes the survey form and a compilation of all replies received by the Task Group.

Amount of Cataloging

The vast majority of the libraries responding to the survey are currently involved in cataloging remote electronic resources. Of the 88 responses, over 95% indicated that the library did cataloging of this nature.

The question of how many remote electronic resources were cataloged by the individual libraries brought many different and wide-ranging responses. This reflects both the priorities, needs, and practices of the individual libraries as well as different interpretations of what the question was asking. Some libraries gave the number of items that are cataloged individually by their catalogers, either by creating new bibliographic records or by using records from a utility. Other libraries gave a number that reflected not only those items cataloged individually by their catalogers, but also those supplied by services such as Serials Solutions and Marcive.

Of those replies that gave a specific or a range of number, the breakdown for the approximate number of remote electronic resources cataloged in a year's time is as follows:

Number Cataloged per Year	Responding Libraries
Less than 100	10
100-500	17
501-1,000	14
1,001-5,000	21
5,001-10,000	2
Greater than 10,000	6

However, even among the libraries that supplied a number or a range of numbers, there were many comments to the effect that the cataloging of these resources has not yet "normalized." Nearly 20% of the libraries that do catalog these resources did not feel comfortable supplying a number at all. This is clearly an activity that has grown greatly over a relatively short period of time, and cataloging agencies are continuing to adjust.

Categories of Resources Cataloged

The categories of remote electronic resources that are being cataloged in our libraries are diverse as well. One general category that demanded the attention of catalogers was those resources for which the library paid, either individually or with the purchase of a print equivalent. The same is true of remote electronic resources that replace print

resources. Free resources, including U.S., state, and local government documents, were also cataloged by large percentage of responding libraries.

BIBCO/CONSER and non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries were nearly identical regarding free electronic resources, with most respondents giving some variant on the theme: “paid over free,” “no cataloging backlog, but in theory paid resources would be cataloged before free resources,” etc. Several libraries noted the happy circumstance of no backlog in cataloging electronic resources, or none yet. One BIBCO/CONSER respondent noted: “We have not set any specific guidelines. Mostly, it is electronic over print. Paid materials would probably get a higher priority if we had to choose.”

While one library noted that all electronic resources cataloged are free, most ranked free as the lowest category, if ranking is applied at all. Several libraries noted the research value of the item as a determinant or the perceived stability of the resource, as evaluated by selectors (“those which will provide greatest impact on study and research,” “free resources are generally only cataloged at selector or faculty request,” “free resources are cataloged in request by bibliographers,” etc.). An exception to free-last practice was noted at one library, where patron requests received top priority and “monographs in e-packages” had the lowest priority.

There were surprisingly few responses that indicated that cooperatively purchased resources were cataloged by their libraries, only 6 such responses in all. Other categories that do not receive cataloging attention from most of the responding libraries include those available for a limited time period, those “under construction,” membership pages, websites of the library and/or its parent institution, and resources providing only abstracts.

Criteria for Selection of Resources to Be Cataloged

The survey responses indicate that many different criteria influence the determination of what remote electronic resources are cataloged for these libraries. Many libraries do not differentiate between these resources and those in any other format--the same criteria and collection development policies are used for all materials collected, including these resources, e.g. relevance to curriculum or mission of the library. Collection development and/or reference librarians often determine which resources are added to the collection and, therefore, cataloged. A few libraries indicated that criteria such as permanence, assurance of quality, or the vendor influenced the decision. Many libraries routinely catalog the resources for which they pay and then have another mechanism, such as referrals from other librarians or patrons, for identifying free resources to be cataloged. Some libraries specified consortial concerns among the criteria used to determine which resources get cataloged. More libraries (40) responded that they do not have a special collection development policy for remote electronic resources than responded (33) that they did have such a policy, although some libraries indicated that a policy was in the development stage.

Who has input into what gets cataloged differs from library to library. Nearly 90% of the libraries indicated that collection development staff played some role in determining which remote electronic resources are cataloged. The second most influential group is reference staff, with over 50% of the responding libraries identifying this group. However, it was pointed out on several surveys that these two groups often overlap each other.

Patrons, including faculty members for academic libraries, play a rather small direct role in determining what gets cataloged at the responding libraries, 19% for patrons in general and 28% for faculty specifically. There were several other categories added by the libraries to reflect the policies and procedures at the individual institutions.

The responses to a question about the percentage of serials in the total number of remote electronic resources cataloged indicated that serials make up a very large percentage of that total number. Half of the responses to the question included a figure over 75% for the serials total. The next highest percentage, 23%, indicated that serials make up between 1% and 25% of the total.

Regardless of the type of electronic resource being cataloged, most libraries (88%) consider the act of cataloging online titles to constitute selection of those titles for permanent access to the collection. Still, comments revealed levels of doubt about the process. A few respondents consider titles to be permanently selected only if the related electronic resource is locally owned, digitized, or archived. Permanence is a doubtful concept on the internet. Respondents noted that access agreements can and do change. Many electronic resources are simply leased, while records are acquired in the aggregate from vendors when available. Some respondents mentioned bulk removal of catalog records upon termination of access to the electronic resources, but no one commented on the mechanics of widespread record deletion or the impact on catalog management or library systems. (Under the customization question, however, some libraries noted the addition of markers to records, which could aid later removal.) Further research is needed on the ramifications of routine addition and deletion of large numbers of records by systems staff at the request of cataloging staff but outside the “standard” processing stream.

Cataloging Priorities

Most libraries have local policies in place for cataloging remote electronic resources, but the ratio of BIBCO/CONSER libraries with local policies to those without such policies is significantly higher than among non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries (over 4:1 as compared with 2:1). Several libraries without local policies mentioned their adherence to national standards or statewide guidelines. Two libraries noted they were in the process of forming local policies, while one BIBCO/CONSER library indicated that decisions about the location of electronic resources have yet to be made: “We do not have a clear policy of where e-resources should reside. Some e-journals are accessible thru the OPAC, and some are available only thru the Web page, and some are in both places.”

Whether an item is paid for or free was frequently cited as a major factor in determining which remote electronic resources get cataloged first. Of the 76 libraries that indicated a method of prioritizing which of these resources are cataloged first, 54 (71%) indicated that items with a cost associated to it were cataloged first. Other factors included research value, consortial demands, rush requests, and relevance to the collection. However, some libraries indicated that, due to the absence of a cataloging backlog, no prioritization was needed.

Staff Involved in Cataloging

The only staff category *not* cataloging electronic resources in any of the responding libraries is volunteers. By far the most cataloging, however, is done by professional staff (in 32 BIBCO/CONSER libraries and 44 non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries). Paraprofessional staff are also widely involved in electronic resource cataloging (in 23 BIBCO/CONSER libraries and 22 non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries). In a handful of libraries (7 and 2, respectively), hourly staff were listed as cataloging electronic resources; one comment noted that student assistants were employed to “catalog” insofar as they added URLs to print records and created holdings records.

In the vast majority of responding libraries (27 BIBCO/CONSER and 36 non-BIBCO/CONSER), cataloging staff handle the cataloging of remote electronic resources. Acquisitions staff in five of the BIBCO/CONSER and one of the non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries catalog electronic resources, as do collection development staff in one library of each category. The nature and extent of cataloging done outside the catalog department is not clearly specified, however: one BIBCO/CONSER library indicated that “Acquisitions and Collection development staff contribute to the cataloging process by creating preliminary records and supplying summaries, but the final cataloging is done by the professional cataloging staff.” Non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries indicated electronic resource cataloging done by government documents librarians and by contract cataloger.

Extent of Cataloging

Catalogers at all libraries responding to the survey routinely assign subject access to the remote electronic resources, but practice was split almost evenly for and against assignment of classification (37 assigned some type of classification, 40 did not). Comments indicate that the classification decision often rests on the format of the resource, with serials, government documents, and organization pages singled out not to receive classification. One respondent noted that practice had evolved: “In most cases ... we no longer classify e-resources.”

Practice has not yet solidified on the “single” versus “separate” record question on how to catalog both tangible and online versions of the same resource. Sixty-eight percent of responding libraries use the single record approach for at least some portion of their electronic resource records (49 of 72 libraries). Three fourths of BIBCO/CONSER libraries (18 of 24) and 65% of non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries (31 of 48) use the single record approach. A number of respondents use the single-record approach when feasible,

but load large sets such as netLibrary and EBSCO records as separate records. The Library of Congress response noted that a group is currently re-evaluating LC policy, particularly in light of LC's goal, stated at ALA's Toronto conference, to emphasize the single-record approach for serials.

The survey results show that, while there is much discussion of MARC alternatives for cataloging electronic resources, very little has yet filtered into practice. Only 18% of respondents (12 of 66) indicated that cataloging staff routinely create non-MARC metadata for electronic resources. Creation of alternative metadata may be gathering steam, however: catalogers at several libraries are involved in advisory capacities, create non-MARC metadata for specific limited projects, or expect to create non-MARC metadata in the near future.

Quality Control

Nearly three quarters of responding libraries (72%, or 56 of 78) do not routinely review remote electronic resources they have cataloged to see if the records created still reflect the items cataloged. One respondent indicated that active serials were checked regularly, but not monographs or integrating resources. Another mentioned that a policy was under development, while another most likely spoke for many with a resolute "No, not yet, but we shall do it in the future."

Slightly more than half of all respondents (41 of 76) reported the use of links checkers to identify non-functional URLs. Two thirds of BIBCO/CONSER libraries use links checkers (20 of 30), although one library ran a checker in the information gateway digital registry rather than the catalog. Most checks range in frequency from weekly to annually, but several respondents noted irregular or ad hoc use of checkers. One comment spoke volumes: "We're looking for one that works."

Supplemental survey questions intended to elicit data about the stability of URLs in catalog records drew confused questions as well as comments, indicating that the original questions could be more clearly phrased. More than 57% of all respondents indicate use of Open URLs, with no statistically valid difference between BIBCO/CONSER libraries and non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries. Most responding libraries use PURLs (51 of 74), although practice differs significantly along BIBCO/CONSER and non-BIBCO/CONSER lines. 61% of non-BIBCO/CONSER (27 of 44) use PURLs, while 80% of BIBCO/CONSER libraries (24 of 30) use them. In both cases, several libraries commented that persistent identifiers are often accepted on catalog copy (such as Marcive or CONSER records) but not actively assigned by catalogers.

Local Customization

One survey question asked about the kinds of local customization libraries make to records acquired from other sources, such as EBSCO, Serials Solutions, netLibrary, and OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets. Not all respondents use such record sets, and some add sets such as netLibrary without any kind of modification. For record sets being

customized, responses could be divided into modifications that could be machine-generated as opposed to record changes that could be made only by individual cataloger assessment. Categories of bulk changes include: 856 fields adapted for local use, holdings creation, access limits and other standard notes, genre headings, access points for the provider or aggregator, and hooks or markers to enable generation of web lists from catalog records, and varying kinds of identifying information to generate management information and aid later record maintenance. More labor-intensive customization includes: collapsing both print and electronic resources onto a single record, making edits on related records if the multiple record approach is used, upgrading cataloging, and assignment of local subject headings and call numbers.

Availability of Records

More than three quarters of the libraries provide catalog access to electronic resources through a local ILS (77%, or 68 of 88 libraries, averaging 83% for BIBCO/CONSER libraries and 73% for non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries). Some input a record at the point of order, but most respondents indicate catalog records are created after electronic resources become fully available to the public.

The great majority of the libraries (86%, or 73 of 85 libraries) make catalog records for electronic resources available to all member libraries in OCLC or RLIN. Of these, all but one responding BIBCO/CONSER library made records available in OCLC or RLIN, while only 78% of non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries made records available in this manner. Level of cataloging varies widely and depends greatly on the provenance of the particular record. One comment noted that the Library of Congress's default for electronic resources is the core level; another respondent commented that the level of the record depends on the level of any existing record cloned to make a new record. BIBCO/CONSER libraries employed a range of cataloging levels within individual libraries (32 full, 14 core, 11 minimal level), while non-BIBCO/CONSER were more likely to catalog records at full level or not at all (25 full, 9 core, 1 minimal level).

Another factor in whether to make records available through a utility is the wider availability of the resource itself. Titles not available through interlibrary loan were less likely to be added to a major utility's database.

What's Needed?

When the responding libraries indicated the categories of remote electronic resources for which they would like see more records available on the national utilities, "electronic journals" was chosen as a high priority by the greatest number of libraries. Of the 34 libraries that assigned it a priority ranking, 25 (74%) indicated that it was a top priority. In a priority ranking of 1-14, this category averaged a 1.6 priority. U.S. government publications were the next top choice, with 9 of the 26 (35%) assigning it a top priority. It averaged a 2.7 priority ranking.

Other categories were chosen by a lot of libraries, but not as a high priority by many. For example, 27 libraries gave a priority ranking for digital library text resources, but only 5 of those (19%) listed it as a top priority, giving it a 3.3 average priority. The full list of categories, along with their percentages for top priority and average priority ranking can be seen in question 15 in Appendix B.

Access beyond Catalog Records

Over 91% of libraries (74 of 81) provide access to remote electronic resources in ways other than cataloging on the local system. Of those, 81% (60) provide access on library websites. Comments demonstrated a wide range of practice. Respondents noted links to record enhancements such as table of contents information and reviews as well as the use of third-party products such as SFX, MetaLib, and Serials Solutions. Several noted that alternative title lists were generated from the catalog on a regular basis.

In those libraries providing alternative access to remote electronic resources, 59% (37 of 63) also provide subject access. Here practice between responding BIBCO/CONSER and non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries varied widely: over 82% of BIBCO/CONSER libraries (19 of 23) provide some form of subject access, compared with 45% of non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries (18 of 40). In all libraries, the prevalent form of alternative subject access is local lists, including very broad terminology based on the curriculum or broad geographic areas. Some libraries reported using the 050 field to sort titles into broad subject categories; one reported extracting LC subject headings for addition to alternative lists as well as the extraction of LC subject headings to be “chopped up, deduped, and added as ‘meta-keywords’ to the HTML files for each text.

Conclusion

Although remote electronic resources have been available and have been cataloged for several years now, the survey findings illustrate that there is great variety in the cataloging practices and policies for these resources from one library to another. As with most issues facing libraries today, considerations must be given to budgets, staffing, efficiency, as well as local concerns.

Vendor-supplied records are playing a very large role in the cataloging of these resources, and this can affect the availability of record via the national utilities, since not all records supplied by the vendors are available on the utilities. The outsourcing of this cataloging to vendors, while offering an efficient and economical way to provide cataloging locally for a great many important resources, impacts standards and sharing of records.

Recommendations

1. Monitor and investigate the ramifications of vendor-supplied cataloging for remote electronic resources, in particular e-journals.
 - a. What is the impact of availability of records in the national utilities.
 - b. As electronic resources replace more and more print resources, what is the impact on cataloging staffing?
2. Determine whether a study is needed to identify viable alternatives to vendor-supplied cataloging.
3. Encourage libraries to contribute their cataloging of remote electronic resources to national utilities, if they are not already doing so.
4. Investigate the relationship between MARC and non-MARC metadata. Can our cataloging records be serving multiple purposes, providing access via cross domain searching as well as via our catalogs?
5. Investigate a way for cataloging records to be made available as new electronic journals are. The proliferation of electronic journals has made this the top priority for needed cataloging records.

Appendix A

SURVEY RESPONDENTS TASK GROUP TO SURVEY PCC LIBRARIES ON CATALOGING OF REMOTE ACCESS ELECTRONIC RESOURCES

The following libraries and other institutions submitted responses to the "PCC Survey on the Cataloging of Remote Electronic Resources."

BIBCO/CONSER:

Arizona State Univ.
Center for Research Libraries
Columbia Univ.
Cornell Univ.
Hong Kong Univ. of Science & Technology
Indiana Univ. Libraries, Bloomington
Library of Congress
National Agricultural Library
National Library of Medicine
National Univ., San Diego
New York Public Library
New York Univ.
Northwestern Univ.
Oberlin College
Oklahoma State Univ.
Princeton Univ.
Queens Borough Public Library
Saint Louis Univ. Law Library
Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Stanford Univ.
State Univ. of New York, Buffalo (2 responses received)
Texas A & M Univ., College Station
U.S. G.P.O., Cataloging Branch
Univ. of California, Berkeley
Univ. of California, Los Angeles
Univ. of California, San Diego
Univ. of Chicago Library
Univ. of Colorado, Boulder
Univ. of Dayton
Univ. of Florida
Univ. of Maryland
Univ. of New Mexico
Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Univ. of Pennsylvania
Univ. of Texas at Austin

Univ. of Washington
Vanderbilt Univ.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER:

Auburn Univ. Libraries
Binghamton Univ.
Bowling Green State Univ.
British Library
Coastal Resource Sharing Network
Delta State Univ.
Dickinson State Univ.
Douglas College Library
Eastern Cluster of Lutheran Seminaries Library, Philadelphia
Emory Univ.
Evanston Public Library, Illinois
Florida International Univ.
Georgia State Univ., College of Law Library
Harvard Univ., Kennedy School of Government Library
Illinois State Univ.
Indiana Univ., Ruth Lilly Medical Library
Iowa State Univ.
Jefferson County Library Cooperative, Alabama
Johnson County Public Library, Kansas
Lawrence Univ., Seeley G. Mudd Library
Library and Archives Canada
Louisiana State Univ.
Maricopa County Community Colleges
McGill Univ. Libraries
Michigan State Univ.
Mississippi State Univ.
Oakland Univ., Kresge Library
Pepperdine Univ.
Providence College
Rutgers Univ.
Saint Louis Univ.
Seyfarth Shaw Library (Law Firm)
Sinclair Community College
Southern Methodist Univ.
Technikon Free State, South Africa
Univ. of Alaska, Anchorage
Univ. of California, Santa Cruz
Univ. of Idaho
Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln
Univ. of North Dakota
Univ. of Northern Iowa

Univ. of San Diego
Univ. of South Carolina, Thomas Cooper Library
Univ. of Texas, Dallas
Univ. of Wyoming
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State Univ. (2 responses received)
Washington Univ., St. Louis
Washington Univ., St. Louis, Law Library
Washington Univ., St. Louis, Medical School Library
Wellcome Library for the History and Understanding of Medicine

Appendix B

PCC ELECTRONIC RESOURCES CATALOGING SURVEY AND RESPONSES

Below is the list of questions included in the "PCC Survey on the Cataloging of Remote Electronic Resources", along with a compilation of the responses for each question. Unless otherwise indicated a bulleted comment reflects a complete response or comment for a question by an individual library.

For the most part, responses are presented in the same form as submitted. However, when possible without losing other information, references to specific libraries or parent institutions have been removed. In some cases, this was not possible, and the information identifying a specific library or institution was retained. Also, URLs supplied on survey responses have been tested and those that do not work have been deleted. For a few questions, like responses have been collapsed into a single comment line.

Definitions:

Remote electronic resource: a resource accessible via the Internet

To catalog: to create a new MARC bibliographic record or use an existing one, with or without editing it

1. Does your library catalog remote access electronic resources?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	35	50
NO	1	3

2. Approximately how many remote electronic resources does your library catalog in a year's time? If more than one library gave the same number, the number of libraries is in parentheses after the number cataloged annually. If there is no number in parentheses, assume that only one library gave this figure.

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

15	500+	1,500-3,500
75	550 (2)	2,000
100	625	2,300 (2)
150	672	2,900
179	700	5,000
180-200	720	11,000
250	Over 1,000	12,000
270	Thousands	16,000
300	1,200	20,000

- 362 monographs; 100 e-serials
- Approximately 700 remote electronic resource titles were individually cataloged in FY03. The number has been steadily increasing from one year to the next. This includes records for locally digitized material, ETDs, Web sites, databases, and e-resource journals. In addition: in FY02 (2,565) and FY03 (459) we cataloged 3,000 remote electronic resources through an automated process involving the utilization of a Web crawler. This is an ongoing project, which should yield hundreds of cataloged records per year.
- The number can vary greatly from year to year. In FY 02/03, we cataloged about 700 e-resource items.
- We individually catalog about 270 per year (240 serials and 30 monographs). Most of the records in our catalog for remote electronic resources have come from batch loads as a result of library or consortial purchases, and vary based on a given year's acquisitions. For example, in FY 00-01 we added 17,335 records for NetLibrary titles, in FY 02-03 some 10,300 records from Ebrary, and we added 10,000-20,000 brief records based on SerialsSolutions data. Regular loads of records from Marcive for federal government publications add to the total, but we have no data on how many link to remote electronic resources.
- Most e-resources are not cataloged in-house (only 235 e-serials were cataloged in the Catalog Dept last year). We get records for e-resources thru tape loads, when the vendor makes them available. We also add many URLs to print bib records. The library reports that in 2001/02, we purchased 16,124 e-journals and 68,845 e-books (a huge number because we loaded EEBO records). This does not mean that we actually cataloged all these titles. We do the authority work on the headings generated by the tape loads.
- For the period Oct. 1, 2002 – Oct. 1, 2003, over 50,000 records for remote electronic resources have been added to the catalog. This includes records from Marcive, record sets from vendors such as ProQuest, and some URLs added to analog records for single record approach in addition to individually cataloged resources. This is just an estimate--there are some number of records (probably a few thousand) that are not included in this count for a variety of reasons.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

2-3	350	2,000
12	500 (2)	2,000-3,000
12-15	600	2,500
15	750	2,500+
20-30	780	3,000
20-200	800	5,000 (2)
50 (2)	900	8,000
100 (2)	1,000 (2)	10,000
100-300	Thousands	10,000+
150 (2)	1,000-2,000	15,000-25,000
200	1,300	As purchased
300-400	1,500 (2)	Varies
Not sure--lots		

3. Which of the following categories of remote electronic resources are cataloged at your library?

	BIBCO/ CONSER	NON- BIBCO/ CONSER
PAID, INDIV. ACQUIRED	34	45
COOPERATIVELY PAID	5	1
E AS ADD-ON TO PRINT	33	39
E FREE WITH PRINT	31	39
FREE INDEXES/DATABASES	29	28
FREE E-JOURNALS	34	33
	BIBCO/ CONSER	NON- BIBCO/ CONSER
FREE E-MONOGRAPHS	29	25
E REPLACING PRINT	33	47
E RELATED TO PRINT	24	24
LIMITED TRIAL PERIOD	1	6
LIB/INST WEBSITES	15	12
DEMOS/SAMPLES	0	0
UNDER CONSTRUCTION	2	0
ABSTRACTS ONLY	6	3
MEMBERSHIP PAGES	2	1
U.S. GOV'T DOCS	35	32
LOCAL/STATE DOCS	34	26
OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)	8	8

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- International, U.N. & foreign government documents
- E-journals that are not easily included in the MARC record service provided by Serials Solutions
- Online databases and portals (subscription and free)
- We purchase many large record sets and use Serials Solutions
- Resources related to other items being cataloged: sometimes; abstracts only: some of our article database titles, etc., are abstracts only
- Free web sites of interest; many related to local government and institutions; foreign language websites (especially Chinese, Korean, & Arabic)
- We include links to tables of contents.
- Selected free websites
- Digitally reformatted
- For "Resources related to other items being cataloged" and "Abstracts only," we add links from records to these categories when appropriate, but do not create

separate records. For more information see:
<http://www.lib.washington.edu/msd/linkincat.htm>

- A few are located at depository library Web sites; some of these by agreement with GPO.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Remote-access digital images
- Stable, free web sites with content that complements the libraries' holdings.
- We have records for U.S. Government Documents but they are added to our catalog by monthly loads of Marcive records. They are not counted in the approximately 50 titles we catalog a year. Of course, that number depends on how many new subscriptions we place.
- Canadian federal government publications, also some Canadian province government publications
- Canadian government documents, documents from NGOs, international bodies such as the UN, FAO, etc.
- Locally developed electronic resources

4. Which staff catalog remote electronic resources at your library?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
PROFESSIONAL	32	44
HOURLY	7	2
PARAPROFESSIONAL	23	22
VOLUNTEER	0	0
CATALOGING STAFF	27	36
ACQUISITIONS STAFF	5	1
COLLECTION DEV. STAFF	1	1
OTHER (SPECIFY BELOW)	4	5

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Plan to train some higher level paraprofessional staff this year
- Catalog staff (records through the California Digital Library's Shared Cataloging Program), GPO catalogers (records through govdocs record loads), netLibrary catalogers (records purchased as a part of the license)
- Hourly (students, etc.): not really cataloging--they add URLs to print records, add holdings records, etc.
- Electronic resources are cataloged by catalogers (professional librarians) in the Cataloging Dept.
- Catalog maintenance staff adds URLs to print records
- Acquisitions and Collection Development staff contribute to the cataloging process by creating preliminary records and supplying summaries, but the final cataloging is done by the professional cataloging staff

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Government Documents librarians
- Contract cataloger

5. What criteria are used in determining which remote electronic resources are selected for cataloging at your library?

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Primary sources related to curriculum and research
- Long-term digitizing project (WorldCat e-set)
- E-journals
- Library has a written policy describing criteria similar to policy for print materials, but including stability of resource and issuing body
- The collection managers determine what remote electronic resources are cataloged, based on our collection development policies.
- Conformance with the library's general collection development policy
- Relevance to the curriculum
- The same criteria as print, except for purchased record sets where it is cheaper or necessary to accept everything in the package.
- The selection criteria are the same for e-resources as for other formats. All selected resources for the general collection or for public access in the Reading Room are cataloged. We are working on amplifying the selection criteria for e-resources in conjunction with the revision of the Collection Manual now underway.
- If purchased or "selected" full-text; stable; other criteria are under consideration
- We catalog most resources linked from the library website
- Those that are paid for and those free ones that have been evaluated by a group of librarians as valuable for our users
- Bibliographers' request
- All resources that we license and/or pay for and items selected by bibliographers and subject specialists.
- Mostly from recommendations by other librarians
- Paid/licensed resources are usually selected; government documents (esp. federal & state) are selected; freely-available resources are selected according to local guidelines
- Collection development officers, including departmental librarians, select them based on an assessment including some degree of permanence, quality assurance, use of standards and best practices, and quality of the library or vendor involved. Ideally, there is faculty involvement and/or involvement of editorial boards. Special effort is made to include local faculty publications.
- We catalog all electronic resources that we acquire.
- Scope of content, relevancy. How do we access--through consortium, do we pay or is it free? It's been requested by library or other faculty, etc.
- All sites selected are cataloged
- Collection Development and subject specialists select the material. The Cataloging Dept. is not aware of their criteria.
- Same criteria as hard copy material

- Paid subscriptions and other fee-based access materials are cataloged. Subject selectors request cataloging of other remote electronic materials based upon their selection criteria.
- Handle rush requests first, then in order of receipt of request
- URLs cited in the work cataloged (e.g. access to full text, abstracts, tables of content), resources referred to the Cat. Dept. by bibliographers, analytics for items in purchased databases
- Cataloged in the order they are referred
- E-resources are selected by collection managers. They use the procedures at <http://web.uflib.ufl.edu/serials/selectserhand.htm> (run mouse over "Electronic Resources") E-resource links may be added to records by catalogers according to the guideline at <http://web.uflib.ufl.edu/rs/rsd/856rguid.html>.
- Recommended by staff of Digital Library Services & Collection Development
- All resources selected by collection development librarians are added to the catalog.
- When determining whether or not to catalog an electronic resource we follow: USC Title 44, Sec. 1902 which indicates that the Superintendent of Documents shall make available for public information “government publications, except those determined by their issuing components to be required for official use only or for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value and publications classified for reasons of national security....”
- The library has collection development selection criteria in place for all purchased materials.
- Electronic resources are selected along the same guidelines as print materials in support of the academic programs at the Univ.
- Resources are evaluated using the same selection criteria for any other resource, relevance to academic curriculum and univ.'s mission, authority, currency, and cost.
- The same criteria as used for print materials or as negotiated thru consortial agreements.
- Formal collection policy statements for electronic resources exist: See <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/electron.html> for general guidelines, <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/geodata.html> for information specific to geospatial data, and <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/webarchive.html> for information related to the selection of archived Web resources and some projects provide additional criteria or other selection assistance (see <http://lcweb.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/beonsel.html> for BEOnline project selection criteria and supplementary guides for selectors at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/questions.html>) It should be noted that the selection guidelines for electronic resources are currently being re-evaluated by staff and contractors of the Library.
- Reputation of the agency publishing the material, item's relation to the goals of our collection development to provide reliable information, collections that contain digitized historical documents that are of interest to our patrons
- Selection is done by public services/collection development staff within their specific academic disciplines. These requests are first forwarded to the Acquisitions Department for initial processing, then on to cataloging.
- See <http://www.lib.washington.edu/msd/internetselguide.html>

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- The major criterion is whether access to the resource would be of value to our patrons and, obviously, whether we can afford it
- Public Service staff, especially the Documents librarian, decide which sites will be cataloged
- Collection Development tells us
- If we pay for them. Resources from the TexShare cooperative databases. If they provide access online to things we pay for. For completely free items we have written selection guidelines, i.e. support the curriculum, stable, authoritative.
- Resources must conform to CONSER guidelines, AACR2, and our institution's local practice.
- First Requested/ordered items, then full-text access by issue or individual vols. (not database), then cost
- Anything we pay for or requires a site license, we catalog. We also had a project to catalog all the "free and unrestricted" electronic journals we have links to from our Information by Subject pages. We get records from Marcive for US government documents. Other electronic resources get cataloged when the bibliographer requests that they be added to the catalog.
- Stable, selected by subject specialists
- Departmental liaisons/selectors send us sites that they want cataloged and entered into EUCLID (our Sirsi system). Catalogers as a rule do not make such selections on their own. Sites are generally felt to support the curriculum, provide additional resources for our users, etc.
- There have been some revisions to this that I don't have on my web page yet: <http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/library/Departments/abc/edocguid.htm>
- User requests, indexed in Medline, cost
- There are no set criteria. We catalog whatever comes our way, either as paid subscriptions, as part of a shared package with other libraries in our consortium, that come with print subscriptions, and so on as noted in question #2. We try to keep to the subjects of study of our institution (which is quite broad).
- Subject relevance (for new titles), electronic form is in addition to or replaces print form already subscribed to
- If it is a resource that the library is paying for, we catalog it. If it is free, it is treated as a gift and the same collection development policy applies: i.e., if one of the collection managers suggests that we, in effect, add it to the collection, we catalog it.
- Subject librarians select them, as they select other formats. This includes collections of e-books, e-journals of all kinds (i.e., those categories mentioned above), but also includes websites and web resources that would be of interest to our users.
- None yet developed. I tend to throw in an 856 if I see a note in the print edition. Cluster catalogers are meeting next week to expand the e-resources we catalog.
- If we subscribe or purchase, and if collection managers request
- Upon public service request
- We only catalog our subscribed E-journals

- We belong to the OhioLINK consortium and add bibliographic data for OhioLINK e-resources to our local catalog. Many of these come through OCLC TechPro though the Ohio State Univ. supplies OCLC cataloging for the OhioLINK databases and BGSU supplies cataloging for streamed videos in the OhioLINK Digital Media Collection. To keep the costs of outsourced cataloging down, we expect to share future cataloging of additional e-collections amongst OhioLINK member libraries where possible. Collection Development librarians work with Serials folks and indicate to Cataloging the titles of e-journals to which we subscribe that offer electronic versions. We also belong to JSTOR and have added cataloging for JSTOR titles. One of our Collection Development librarians also suggests free Internet sites for cataloging based on her assessment of their utility and relative permanence. Reference and Collection Development librarians track OhioLINK and our own databases and let us know what to catalog or kill ... we weeded some e-databases over the summer due to budgetary constraints. Documents has us catalog items that are available only in electronic format and add 856's to appropriate Docs bib records (GPO Purl preferred). The links are checked by Cataloging staff.
- Based on the library's main collection development policy ... resources that support the mission of the univ. If we receive a title in print we catalog the full-text electronic resource. Titles included in the SuDoc system. Free resources related to the collection development policies of the library.
- They are contributed by anyone; reviewed by Collection Development staff; need to have educational value and significance; relevancy to classes
- The resource should be within scope and well reviewed, undergo a rigorous selection process, and maintain a balance in subject coverage.
- Unable to supply
- If they're replacing a print subscription, if they fit a collection profile, if they are free, coverage--if it's a vendor offering free coverage for only a particular timeframe, we usually will pass, although exceptions have been made for the natural sciences
- We have mainly e-journals, documents, and ebooks. These are received because of their content, which is in line with research being done, and classes being offered.
- Things we had in print; things the Collection Development Librarian or other Librarian feels are suitable; things we pay for
- They must be suitable for the collection and adhere to our collection development policy. Also, any resource with a license has to be cleared with our acquisitions librarian.
- Value to patrons for research
- We've paid for them, and can negotiate IP address recognition, faculty have requested their addition to the catalog, reference librarians or liaisons have requested their addition, federal gov. docs. supplied through Marcive tapes
- Curriculum related resources are recommended by bibliographers or other librarians, Journals that are part of subscription services, e.g. JSTOR
- Anything that is selected by collection development staff is cataloged. We have a web form they use to submit free web sites that they wish to be included in the

catalog. Full text journals in aggregated databases are cataloged selectively, depending on the perceived stability of the database and staff time.

- Databases and journals for which we pay to have access, netLibrary books, federal documents, Wisconsin documents, Journals which come free with paper subscriptions, databases which would support the curriculum and are of high quality
- Stable, free web sites with content that complements the libraries' holdings.
- USGPO profile
- Any to which we subscribe. Those purchased cooperatively with our main library system are cataloged by them.
- We collect Canadiana networked electronic publications according to assigned levels of access and preservation which are determined by the publication's significance in fulfilling the library's mandate and in supporting library services. We endeavour to collect comprehensively and archive indefinitely original Canadiana networked electronic publications of Canadian origin and published abroad. The usual definitions of Canadiana, including the definitions of Canadian creator and Canadian subject, and the categories and types of materials collected as outlined in the Canadiana Collection Guidelines in the Collection Management Policy (1990), apply to the collection of networked electronic publications. The Library does not necessarily collect every version/edition of all networked electronic publications collected. The Library does not collect every format of all networked publications collected. The Library allocates priority to collecting standard format publications. The Library ensures that formats collected include those accessible to the perceptually disabled.
- Quality of electronic content, Relevant subject area, Price, Stable URLs which link to table of contents for a journal Update service availability
- Electronic resources are selected for purchase based on suggestions from librarians and faculty, and are evaluated by all librarians. All purchased electronic resources are cataloged at least at the collection level. Free electronic resources are cataloged by request of librarians.
- A collection development librarian must select and sign the request to catalogue.
- At this time we are focusing on what we have paid for or what we get with text title we have paid for.
- Bibliographers make the decision based on collection development policies
- Those resources for which order records must be created
- Purchased: Selection policy should support the Library's mission & strategy, and e-resources should be consistent with the Library's coll. dev. policy and fall within current collecting guidelines. They should be fully usable by readers and provide value for money. Any duplication of a print pub. already held by the Library should offer value-added features (i.e. enhanced content, simultaneous access, or searching & linking facilities) Also receive remote electronic resources on voluntary deposit scheme
- The Libraries Collection Development Policy is used for the selection and cataloging of all library materials, regardless of format.
- Usefulness to patrons, reliable content, reliable presence (stability), no registration required to enter the site

- Paid serials, databases and monographs (in that order), special project with US government documents, free materials upon request from bibliographers.
- Selected by collection development librarians at each of the 10 colleges. They notify cataloging of the resource, or ask that a link be added to the record for the parallel print source.
- If the library purchases it, we catalog it
- Our selection criteria are in two similar documents on cataloging electronic resources. The URLs are: [serials]
<http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/cataloging/policies/e-ejour.shtml>;
 [monographs]
http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/cataloging/procedures/cataloging_electronic_monographs.shtml

6. What priorities determine which resources receive cataloging first, e.g. paid over free, "free-with-paid" over free?

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Paid over free (9 BIBCO/CONSER libraries gave this priority). Four of these libraries gave "free-with-paid" as an intermediate priority over free resources.
- All items are cataloged in the order in which they are received (4 BIBCO/CONSER libraries gave this priority).
- Those which will provide greatest impact on study and research
- No cataloging backlog, but in theory paid resources would be cataloged before free resources
- The priorities are assigned following the subject content and language of the item to be cataloged; whether the resource is licensed vs. free does come into consideration. E-resources are generally cataloged first come first out as they are acquired, although resources that are indexed in NLM indexing databases are cataloged as a higher priority.
- In general paid over free and free-with-paid over free. Also generally first-in, first-out with packages that are easy to finish sometimes getting attention first
- No documented priority, but we automatically catalog resources that we pay for. Free resources are cataloged in request by bibliographers
- We have not set any specific guidelines. Mostly, it is electronic over print. Paid materials would probably get a higher priority if we had to choose.
- Those for which we pay a fee or subscription are always cataloged first; next would be free ejournals; other recommended free web sites as time permits
- Rush-requested by selector; licensed resource OR Shared Cataloging Program resource OR comes-with-subscription resource
- Consortial over individual; paid over free
- Handle rush requests first, then in order of request
- Material we pay for and electronic resources deemed especially important (whether paid or free) by Collection Development staff and selectors are cataloged "first".
- In general, resources for which we pay are considered to have a higher priority; however, we respond to any special request for the branch librarians.

- We do not have established priorities for cataloging e-resources separate from cataloging other material. Collection managers and the Digital Library Center may request that we rush catalog an e-resource just as they may request that we rush catalog a book or video.
- All e-resources are cataloged shortly after activation. E-resources being added to our "Find Databases" collection are given highest priority. Within that subset, resources that are the most costly are done first.
- All are free; some only within depository library facilities.
- Paid resources take priority over free. Free resources are generally only cataloged at selector or faculty request.
- The Library is currently working on developing such criteria. For any materials added to the LC collections, cataloging priorities are set according to research value and likelihood that a work will be widely acquired by US libraries. A working group is currently exploring ways to ensure that cataloging priorities for e-resources are aligned with LC-wide policy for cataloging priorities in general.
- The turnaround time is very fast for paid resources. Free resources are also considered important and are high on the priority list.
- All electronic resources are given priority--paid electronic resources usually receive cataloging first.
- We generally catalog materials in chronological order, as we receive them in cataloging. Materials identified as rush by the selectors always take precedence of the "regular" ones.
- A brief bib is input for all resources that are selected, whether paid or free. This is done within a few days of receiving a request via the form at: <http://www.lib.washington.edu/asp/registry/add.asp>; serials acquisitions staff also create brief bibs for purchased ejournals. Catalogers create full MARC records for most resources. Priority is given to paid over free.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Paid over free (15 non-BIBCO/CONSER libraries gave this priority). Two of these libraries gave "free-with-paid" as an intermediate priority over free resources.
- All items are cataloged in the order in which they are received (3 BIBCO/CONSER libraries gave this priority).
- Purchased/paid for get cataloged first and items needed for instruction we are told about
- Paid first; TexShare second; everything else last.
- Paid subscriptions; requests; items replacing print; electronic access with print; gov. docs; free
- Anything selected, paid or free-with-paid or free (including depository) are all considered at the same level. The only resources that come second are scattered web sites people "run into" or temporary access obtained by another library on campus that we can access due to the IP range
- There are no set priorities. Generally paid, in some way or other, will take precedence over free, but it's not a formalized process.
- Collection managers usually determine priorities, but priorities can also be driven by availability of records

- No need for priority guidelines yet, since we are quite up-to-date
- Local purchases have top priority, including free with subscription. We usually wait for OhioLINK cataloging to be made available to us for OhioLINK materials. We'll catalog anything free suggested to us by the Public Services folks, but these tend to be of lower priority simply because we ask them to try to determine ongoing value and make a guess on how long the resource is liable to be available before we do the cataloging.
- The paid resources would be cataloged first over the free titles. Titles that have been requested as "rush" from a faculty member.
- Paid - received as part of a consortium, purchased by this campus only, free
- If they are replacing a cancelled print subscription, if we're adding e-access to a print record (we use the one-record approach), selection by a particular librarian (bibliographer)
- They all get done immediately. This is because they're live by the time the librarians tell me about them. And of course, if they're live patrons might want to use them...immediately. <sigh>
- No priorities set
- All electronic resources have priority; we have no backlog of E-resource cataloging.
- Time constraints; number of items; paid before free
- First priority: paid resources, i.e. databases and e-journals; second priority: free with print e-journals; third priority: full text journals within aggregated databases; fourth priority: free sites
- Paid over free; depository items over "free"; free with paid
- I pushed to include the resources to which the consortium libraries subscribe and have also cataloged some free web sites.
- I catalog them as we "acquire" them and, when appropriate, the Reference Librarians have the passwords from the source to give to our students.
- Same cataloguing priorities apply to e-publications as to other publications; preference given to Canadiana of recent imprint date, especially in the fields of Canadian history, literature and music.
- Paid over free; relevance to needs of faculty and students; stability of URLs; stability of database content
- Paid single titles; government documents that are in high demand (topical, in the news, etc.); documents required for courses-- priorities for aggregations are set by our Advisory Committee on Technical Services
- Generally paid before free and based on bibliographer's request, e.g. rush or priority needed for particular class presentation or promotion
- Priority is usually determined by what we have invested in the resource, therefore we catalog paid first, free-with-paid next, and free last. Exceptions are made by request.
- Need for payment record means paid over free, government lobbying for access to government material.
- Patron request; packages (serials with available copy receive cataloging first); individual titles receives through our Central Request stream, Selector Request stream, and Free Resources; monographs in e-packages currently receive the lowest priority

7. Does your library catalog online titles locally in an ILS for access via your library's OPAC?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
NO	6	14
TIME OF ORDERING	3	2
WHEN AVAILABLE	19	28
WHEN LICENSE SIGNED	3	4
OTHER	6	3

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- We have a record at the point of order but "catalog" at the point when the resource is fully available
- The library catalogs online titles through OCLC for access through the library's OPAC
- No--but we do add electronic access to print records without putting our symbol on an electronic record--this is not 'cataloging' but 'noting' the resource.
- When the Internet Committee notifies the Cataloging Dept. that a site has been selected.
- Also when license is signed & when Cataloging is notified that a resource is available
- We do not have an ILS, but instead use OCLC to catalog. Files of catalog records are received daily from OCLC and are added to our internal database. These records also appear in our Catalog of Government Publications (CGP), <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/cgp/index.html>, which is normally updated daily. Later they appear in the paper Monthly Catalog of United States Publications.
- All of the above depending on the nature of the package, availability of information, local vs. consortial package. We catalog on OCLC and export into our local ILS.
- Time of ordering or when resource is available. Between selection for digitization and online availability.
- Between selection for digitization and online availability.
- Paid resources have a brief bib input at the time of ordering, but the record is suppressed from the catalog until a URL is available. Free resources have brief bibs input and showing in the catalog with a URL at the time they are requested. Completed full cataloging for brief bibs is done later as part of cataloging workflow.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Records are imported if available at the time of ordering. Provisional if no OCLC. With the URL suppressed until the resource is available. I am not positive but, I am pretty sure the license has been agreed to when the cataloging staff is alerted that the resource is available

- Though we may have locally keyed records for some electronic items "on order," these are replaced with OCLC cataloging when the titles are cataloged.
- We do not have an ILS (integrated library system). We do catalog online titles locally in our catalog maintenance system that then displays in the OPAC. We catalog when the resource is available.
- Our payments are totally separate from the cataloging when we're talking about e-journals. They are already paid for, THEN we catalog them.
- Often, when we find out about something on the web - a publication or site; often when we find out about a Gov Doc. that we have access to because we are a partial depository.
- I'm not sure I know what ILS stands for (integrated library system?). If that's what you mean by ILS, no, we don't do any interim-type, local cataloging. Acquisitions may download a record at the time of ordering, but the record is suppressed to the public until we receive the item, at which time it receives full-level cataloging or copy cataloging.
- When the ftp comes from vendor
- When the item is archived on the Library and Archives Canada site, in the electronic collection.
- For free and paid resources (serials), import into local system from OCLC at time of cataloging. For paid databases, an in-process record is created by Acquisitions. When the title is cataloged, this in-process record is overlaid with the cataloged record.
- We don't have an ILS yet

8. Are your library's catalog records for electronic resources made available to all member libraries in OCLC or RLIN?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	35	38
NO	1	11

If so, at what level do you catalog these titles?:

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
FULL	32	25
CORE	14	9
MINIMAL	11	1

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- In most cases we merely attach an 856 to the serial in question. This is done solely in the local database. However, for our LLMC Digital WorldCat Set, all records are

e-records and created in OCLC. If all we hold is the electronic version for which we cannot provide ILL service, the library's holdings are NOT set in OCLC.

- Some records in the catalog may be supplied by a vendor or may be machine-derived
- Added comment from Serials: "Yes, if they are 'cataloged' on a separate record."
- Depending on the resource, records may be full or abbreviated (level 3)
- Most are cataloged minimal level; many such as congressional documents, General Accounting Office publications, and some other categories of publications are always cataloged full-level. Those titles already represented by a full level or core-level record on OCLC are cataloged at the level of the existing record. Also, if there are existing full level or core-level OCLC records for tangible equivalents that can be cloned to create online records, the newly created online record is coded either full or core, depending on which standard is met.
- Yes for monographs, no for serials
- Core is the default level in LC Cataloging Directorate. World Bank Collection is done minimally
- A mixture of full and core level. Monographs are mostly full, serials are a combination of full and core.
- Most are done at full level, but catalogers may use core level at their discretion.
- Yes, both. We use OCLC to catalog and RLIN receives our records electronically.

9. Does your library assign some type of classification scheme to records that represent online titles?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	15	22
NO	13	27

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Serials not classed; other resources are classed in LC
- Some government documents or mini-cataloged resources lack classification
- We do not provide LCC for simple society and organization homepages
- We assign LC call numbers to resources in the Find Databases collection. In most cases, however, we no longer classify e-resources.
- Yes, SuDocs classification numbers
- Yes, monographic and integrating resources receive an LC classification number (e.g., 050 \$a only, no full call number).

10. Do you assign subject access to the remote electronic resources cataloged by your library?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	34	50
NO	0	0

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Most monographic and integrating electronic resources have LC subject headings assigned to them. In addition, we also assign local index terms for resources that are entered in our Find Databases portal. Most e-journals are not assigned subject headings.
- Yes, we assign at least one LCSH subject heading and add more if required by special LC's Subject Catalog Manual rules.

11. If your library uses records from other sources (EBSCO, Serials Solutions, netLibrary, OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets, OCLC TechPro, etc.), what local customization is made to these records?

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- We create records for OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets (LLMC Digital). Local customization includes addition of 655 7 for type of resource (e.g., electronic journals)
- Local subject fields that are indexed in an e-resource database
- Holdings, location, clean-up of cataloging, 856 fields (subfields a & z)
- 506 field added: "Internet access restricted to authorized users for teaching and research purposes"
- Various changes made (e.g. 130 field) to distinguish record for online version from that for print version
- 655, 006/007, 506, 710 for provider
- Varies considerably, for example, between records where we are adding access to records for print versions and records for just the online version
- We use these--it depends on the quality of the set--usually we customize by adding some extra fields required by our ILS
- The records are sent through our automated authorities vendor and replaced when they return. We make sure that there is a 506 field present because we use this field to select records to pass through the proxy server. We make sure that the call number field has the appropriate substitution (Available online) and that the library and location are correct in the item fields.
- 910 field to identify source, 655 -7 Online resources. \$2 local; 049 to generate holdings record; for Shared Cataloging Program: 530 Available to subscribers note, 590 Licensed note, 856 \$x CDL

- Holdings information; URL adjusted to accommodate access through local library portal
- Add 222 if periodical, add 506, remove 650 _4's, verify 856 and add subfield z, delete all unneeded 856's, add local codes for internet resource, consortial resource, etc.
- Call number; Authority work; Extra subject headings as needed; 655 genre heading Web site. , \$2 local (to enable us to pull all of the electronic materials together in one search)
- When possible, we have item records and notes added.
- We do not use tapeloaded records or records other than those downloaded by our utility (OCLC).
- Local customization is to match to print record and add URL, or add complete electronic record if no print exists so as to keep as much as possible to our single-record policy. So far have used record from E-brary, Early English Books Online, Knovel, and the David Rumsey digital map collection. We are in the process of trying to use records provided by TDNet
- Notes about library subscription and patron access, 730s for tracing database name(s), 006/007 if needed, 655 if needed, wording of 856\$z, call number modification, location code editing
- 856 may be revised
- Moving 866 field from bib to holdings records and adding access restriction note to holdings records
- We add uniform titles to all of these records with a qualifier for the provider or aggregator. We also add local fields that enable quick identification and extraction of the records by type (e-journal or other e-resource) and supplier or aggregator where appropriate. We may also add disclaimers regarding coverage in those cases where we know coverage is incomplete or varies (e.g., JSTOR, ProQuest titles with embargoes).
- Most monographic and integrating electronic resources have LC subject headings assigned to them. In addition, we also assign local index terms for resources that are entered in our Find Databases portal. Most e-journals are not assigned subject headings.
- Yes, we assign at least one LCSH subject heading and add more if required by LC's Subject Catalog Manual rules.
- We only adapt OCLC records. We revise them to meet GPO's in-house standards described in the GPO Catalog Guidelines and, with the exception of minimal-level records, revise them, if needed, to meet PCC full or core level standards
- We have not done so, but in the future we may use such records
- Call numbers
- The library customizes the Serials Solutions spreadsheet for formatting and searchability reasons
- Records are manipulated to meet national standards as needed. Some require little modification, other more so. The nature of modifications varies quite a bit, but some typical ones are addition of added access point, URLs, 007 and 530; conversion of record from "single" to "separate" or vice versa; and various

corrections. We also create OCLC WorldCat Collection Sets, both for single and separate records.

- LC-at-Large has not used such records to date. Congressional Research Services (CRS), a unit within LC, uses netLibrary records.
- Serials Solutions records, customizations done by Serials Solutions and not locally. Records for monographic items from netLibrary and ProQuest are loaded as well. For these, a set number is added in the 925 field which identifies record reuse guidelines and \$z 856 local note.
- We customize the 856 field. We do authority work on new headings.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- We add a 655 Computer network resources (form/genre heading) and a 740 with a uniform title (Online)
- For netLibrary records (not included in the number for #2), we create a holding record for the URL
- We add copy statements to records. We add notes fields as needed.
- Genre headings, Addition of access point for packages (i.e. JSTOR, etc.), URL editing (proxy or IP authenticated URL), z for holdings info.
- We have a local program that takes the comma-delineated data from Serials Solutions and converts the data to a MARC record. We don't acquire full MARC records from Serials Solution.
- They are loaded as separate records (not piggybacked onto an existing print record if one is available). We use information within the item record as a hook, in case we want to pull these record out at a later date.
- 856 field
- We do not use records from other sources
- We take records from OCLC and edit 007/007/008 to our local standard values, add subject and genre headings if none present, upgrade the general cataloguing e.g., 1XX, 2XX, 7XX, if we think it is deficient. Check and update URL in 856 if necessary. If we have print and electronic version of same resource, we put both together on same record and use GMD [text and electronic resource]; other use [electronic resource]
- We have imported the netLibrary records and are currently receiving the Documenting the American South records from OCLC. The main customization we make is to mark the records (indicating whether they are electronic journals, electronic monographs, or websites and their source, such as netLibrary) because the marker is needed for generating our web lists of electronic journals and electronic monographs from the catalog.
- Proxy server URL is added, and the prefix "Internet" or "Internet Per" is added to 050/090
- Some fields that help us identify and count the records, edit 856 tag, and sometimes an author added entry
- Record must have 007, 530 or 538, 850 or 920 (Library has tag instead of holdings records), 856 with subfields 3, z, x and u
- If we have print version of titles, we only add 530 and 856 fields to the record. 2. If we have no bib record for the online title, we download record from OCLC. Add

506, 516, 530, 776 as needed. Add #3 Full text available from HeinOnline: 1978-2002; click here before #u in 856 field. We create MFHD for the bib record only showing EPER (E-journal location code). We don't assign call number and have no 866 field.

- EBSCO not added, netLibrary added without customization -- we do correct invalid headings in netLibrary records after they are loaded -- For WorldCat Collection Sets and other OCLC (TechPro, regular OCLC input or copy cataloging) we add a suppressed item record to aid in collocation for later bib maintenance
- We add 655 to each record to reflect the format. For example, for netLibrary titles we would add Electronic books. Add a public note to the 856 "Click Here For Electronic Version."
- The consortium records are cataloged by TechPro
- Serials Solutions...nothing...they were tape loaded. EBSCO, we add the proxy server address and a masking phrase since we put the URL and holdings on the holdings statement
- Local note linking to print publication if we have it
- We bring all records up to full level if they are not already, and we verify all information in existing records before we accept copy.
- Other format information, especially for serials where parts of a run are available in paper as well.
- We have access notes added in the 856, \$z indicating access limits
- Genre headings added, added entry added for provider, call number not used now but brought in 945 field for future use
- Edit call number and location, edit mfhd, edit subject headings, add descriptor for url use
- Authority heading cleanup, Change in encoding level in the local catalog to identify online resources with no holdings so that the records will not be deleted during with other records lacking holdings, Add genre heading "Computer network resources."
- The records we get from Marcive are edited by our profile before we get them; we add only material codes.
- Records are coded correctly, several fields are added according to local standards, and holdings statements are added indicating the volume and date that the full-text begins and/or the time period of embargo on the title.
- Addition of EZProxy prefix to URLs for authentication purposes, modification of URL display text, addition of notes explaining availability and access restrictions, addition of form subject headings, if not already present (e.g. "Electronic books", "Electronic journals", etc.), in some cases, addition of a local generic call number.
- We purchase and batch load records for aggregations when available. We write a local fix file to clean the records and try to bring them up to a reasonable standard before loading. The fix files usually have to clean fixed fields, fix or add 006 and 007, clean up notes, get rid of obsolete fields, subfields and indicators, plus ensure that the url will lead the user somewhere useful. In some cases, we have had to delete the urls sent to us and replace with a common base url because urls sent with the records were not valid for users at our institution.
- Holdings location, generic call number, our access to link

- We currently batch load records from PromptCat and Marcive. (We have not been batch-loading any records from netLibrary recently, following the workflow changes where Tech Serv staff now download records from OCLC for netLibrary titles being ordered, on an individual title basis.) We're not doing any customization of the bib records themselves prior to loading. The only local customization consists of copying information from the bib record to the item record being created in Horizon: call number, location, collection, item type, item status.
- We do not catalog these resources yet
- We largely accept netLibrary and ebrary records as provided by the vendor
- EBSCO: if the ISSN on the EBSCO-supplied record matches the ISSN of a print, microform, or an existing electronic resource record in our catalog, only the 856 is added to that record. Marcive (US docs): print, microform, and electronic versions are combined in a single record

12. Does your library provide access to remote electronic resources in ways other than cataloging for your local system? If so, how?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
NO	1	6
LISTING ON LIB. WEBSITE	23	37
COMMERCIAL PORTAL	0	3
OTHER	3	8

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Subject/format database on the library's website
- NLM digital collections are available on Website and portals (e.g. Profiles in science)
- SFX
- SFX, bibliographers' web pages
- We have a locally developed database for electronic journals and one for electronic databases and resources. The bibliographers also maintain subject guide web pages.
- Local E-Resources database (ERDb)
- TD-NET
- Yes, remote electronic resources also appear in New Electronic Titles. The source for NET is the CGP.
- Local portal. While comparable to a title list, UCSD offers something we call Sage which contains annotations and other summary info about the resources created and maintained by the bibliographers (see <http://libraries.ucsd.edu/sage/subjects/>)
- MODS records are created for selective bulk harvested archival collections. We link to selected full text electronic versions held by other institutions through the 856 field for the record for the identical print item. We provide links to table of contents, publisher descriptions, sample texts, and reading group guides through the 856 field for TOCs that are scanned or for all categories that can be extracted from

ONIX (ONline Information eXchange) files received from publishers or ONIX suppliers. We provide links to reviews of items we match on with the H-Net Reviews in the Humanities and Social Sciences in the 856 field. The LC Portal Applications Interest Group has proposed a list of functionalities for a portal application suitable for large national libraries, which is now available for public comment at <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/lcpaig/>

- Selected fee-based databases are highlighted on the library's web page

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Website available on the Library webpage organized by title and by subject created from data extracted from the ILS weekly.
- Via GALILEO
- We will be using MetaLib next year
- The library's lists of electronic journals and electronic monographs are both generated directly from the catalog on a daily basis.
- Zope database
- Public services folks like to keep their own lists and make some resources available through their finding aids which are HTML or .pdf documents
- Serials Solutions, listings on subject pages
- OpenURL
- In-house electronic documents management system provides limited access by title, Dewey number
- The central web listing has been phased out (right now it is just the output from the OPAC). Some branch libraries continue to maintain their own web listing.
- Customized implementation of Zportal, multi-institution research project (Fretwell Downing)

13. Does your library consider the act of cataloging online titles to constitute the selection of these titles for permanent public access via your library's collection?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	25	38
NO	2	7

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- This is the case for a relatively small set of resources in that NLM considers cataloging of NLM-produced electronic resources to constitute the selection of these titles for permanent public access via the NLM's OPAC/collection.
- I don't believe we would state our cataloging of electronic resources philosophy so formally
- I don't understand what you mean by "permanent." In my experience, nothing on the internet is permanent. We provide cataloging records for resources to which we currently have access. When access is lost, either through cancellation of subscription or removal of resource from internet, we remove the record. We also

lease thousands of ebooks through OhioLINK from a variety of sources. These are not "permanent." They are added and removed based on contract details. Are they chosen for our collection? Yes. Are they permanent? No.

- Not necessarily. We remove records if our access arrangement ceases or the resource otherwise becomes unavailable.
- A number of online documents are selected and cataloged by catalogers assigned the responsibility of mining and cataloging certain Web sites. Some are found by catalogers when they are cataloging a tangible equivalent. A number of others are selected by GPO staff that work outside the Cataloging Branch. Depository librarians have also recommended a significant number of online documents for cataloging.
- If our license agreement terminates, the record may not remain in our catalog.
- No, not unless we own, have digitized and/or have archived the resource.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Yes, only on campus. Lecturers and researchers must require a special password to access these from off-campus sites.

14. Who determines what remote electronic resources are cataloged at your library?
Please check all that apply. If you are checking more than one, please indicate a priority for each, if applicable for your library. (Number in parentheses in table below indicates the number of responses for the value.)

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
COLLECTION DEV. STAFF	1 (14) 2 (4) Y (15)	1 (29) 2 (4) Y (10)
FACULTY MEMBERS	3 (2) Y (7)	1 (2) 2 (2) 3 (6) 4 (1) Y (5)
REFERENCE STAFF	1 (1) 2 (5) 3 (1) Y (10)	1 (5) 2 (12) 3 (4) Y (9)
USERS	4 (2) Y (4)	1 (2) 4 (3) 5 (1) Y (1)
OTHERS	1(5) 3(1) 5 (1) Y (8)	1 (5) 2 (1) 3 (2) Y (3)

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Anyone who discovers a useful site/source may recommend that it be added to the catalog. Reputable, stable sites are almost always added.
- Catalogers
- A Web group consisting of librarians who have been assigned to be responsible for selecting free resources for cataloging
- The Associate Librarian for Collections Development, who is responsible for negotiating licenses that span multiple libraries. Also, if faculty or users request something to be cataloged, it would go through the collections development staff. Most of the collections development staff are professional librarians who also have reference duties in most cases, so the two categories above represent professional librarians who select materials for the library.
- Consortium
- There are separate committees of librarians who are responsible for selecting relevant sites in English, Chinese, Korean, Arabic, French, Spanish and Russian.
- Subject specialists, primarily Reference staff
- Cataloging staff
- Acquisitions informs us of new subscription packages, and we try to keep up with additions to packages already cataloged.
- Catalogers may add links to records according to:
<http://web.uflib.ufl.edu/rs/rsd/856rguid.html>
- Digital Library Services staff
- Cataloger
- Library managers, cataloging staff, publishers to a certain extent ISSN applications.
- Tech Services Director often suggests collections to catalog. I have also (during the past 8 years) used the Scout Report and other library publications to locate resources to catalog that would be of value to our patrons.
- Catalogers will add links for electronic versions of tangible resources when known, without a separate selection decision. Our public services staff do both collection development and reference.
- Serials department head, in consultation with associate director and reference staff

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Cataloging staff
- Cataloging queue
- The catalogers have some dialog with collection/reference staff in both the policy for free resources and during the actual cataloging process.
- Consortial decision
- By "Collection development staff," I mean the bibliographers, who are library faculty with duties in other areas as well.
- Electronic resources that are selected and acquired are cataloged (except for aggregations)
- For serials a serials selection committee is the prime decision maker on selection, though all of the above can also make selections. Generally they still must go through the committee. As for monographs, it's collections development mostly, though we also just catalog whatever comes our way.

- In our case, the reference librarians are also the collection managers
- Consortia--VIVA
- Library director
- OhioLINK consortial purchases
- Various listservs and reference tools
- Consortium purchases (California Digital Library)
- Acquisitions staff, Cataloging staff
- Cataloger
- Anyone can suggest a site; acquisitions/collection development librarian makes the final decision.

15. Are there specific categories of remote electronic resources for which you would like to see more catalog records available in OCLC and RLIN? If more than one category is selected, please indicate priority order (1, 2, 3, etc.) (Number in parentheses in table below indicates the number of responses for the value.)

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER	TOP PRIORITY PERCENTAGE	AVERAGE PRIORITY RANKING
U.S. GOV'T PUBS	1 (5) 2 (4) 3 (2) 4 (2) 5 (3)	1 (4) 2 (1) 3 (3) 4 (1) 9 (1) Y (3)	35	2.7
INTERNATIONA L GOV'T PUBS	1 (1) 2 (4) 3 (2) 4 (3) 6 (3) 9 (1) Y (1)	1 (3) 2 (1) 3 (2) 6 (1) 7 (1) Y (3)	18	3.5
GOV'T PUBS FROM OTHER COUNTRIES	2 (2) 3 (1) 4 (4) 5 (2) 8 (1) 9 (1)	1 (2) 2 (1) 4 (1) 5 (1) 7 (1) 13 (1) Y (3)	11	4.4
LOCAL GOV'T PUBS	2 (2) 3 (3) 4 (4) 5 (1) 6 (1) 8 (1)	1 (3) 3 (1) 5 (2) 7 (1) 11 (1) Y (2)	15	4.1

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER	TOP PRIORITY PERCENTAGE	AVERAGE PRIORITY RANKING
STATE GOV'T PUBS	1 (2) 2 (1) 3 (1) 4 (6) 5 (1) 6 (1) 7 (3) Y (1)	1 (2) 2 (4) 3 (3) 4 (1) 5 (3) 6 (1) 8 (1) Y (6)	13	3.8
E-JOURNALS	1 (12) 3 (2) Y (3)	1 (13) 2 (2) 3 (3) 6 (2) Y (3)	74	1.6
DATABASES	1 (2) 2 (5) 3 (3) 4 (1) 5 (1) Y (3)	1 (2) 2 (7) 3 (3) 4 (4) 7 (1) Y (5)	15	2.9
DIGITAL LIBRARY TEXT	1 (3) 2 (6) 3 (3) 4 (1) 6 (1) 10 (1) Y (3)	1 (2) 2 (1) 3 (3) 4 (1) 5 (4) 8 (1) Y (4)	19	3.3
DIGITAL LIBRARY IMAGE	1 (1) 3 (3) 5 (1) 6 (1) 9 (1) Y (3)	1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (2) 4 (1) 7 (2) 10 (2) Y (2)	12	4.6
DIGITAL LIBRARY MIXED	1 (1) 3 (3) 8 (1) 12 (1) Y (1)	1 (1) 2 (2) 3 (2) 4 (1) 6 (1) 9 (2)	13	4.0

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER	TOP PRIORITY PERCENTAGE	AVERAGE PRIORITY RANKING
DIGITAL LIBRARY SOUND/MUSIC	1 (1) 3 (1) 4 (1) 10 (1) 11 (1) Y (1)	1 (1) 2 (2) 4 (3) 5 (1) 6 (1) 11 (1) 12 (1) Y (2)	13	5.3
OTHER DIGITAL LIBRARY	1 (1) 4 (1) Y (1)	1 (1) 8 (1)	50	3.5
MAPS	2 (2) 4 (1) 5 (3) 6 (1) Y (2)	2 (1) 3 (1) 4 (1) 5 (1) 7 (1) 10 (1) 12 (2) Y (5)	0	5.6
OTHER	1 (2) 4 (1) Y (1)	1 (1)	75	1.8

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Also indexes
- Generally, however, we find copy for the titles we catalog--in fact, there is often too much copy!
- Selective list of authoritative subject-specific web sites in various languages.
- Web sites of organizations: museums, galleries, scientific associations, etc.
- What would be good is an expansion of "organized" record sets. Perhaps OCLC could expand on their record sets by manipulating records (e.g., using the print records and converting them to "separate" electronic records-- then releasing them on a package basis. OCLC already does this to an extent. (IEEE Xplore and ACM Digital Library)
- Working papers/discussion papers of research value that generally appear in monographic series.
- Digital library text collections = analysis of large packages

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- I would like to see BETTER records for databases and e-journals and CLEAN-UP when the resource has changed significantly.

SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS:

1. Do you have a cataloging policy for remote electronic resources?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	26	33
NO	6	16

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Our current procedures can be found online at:
<http://www.library.cornell.edu/voyager/Bibs/ECat/e-catTOC.html>
- These are included in the GPO Cataloging Guidelines, 4th ed.
- We are in the process of formulating it
- We do not have a clear policy of where e-resources should reside. Some e-journals are accessible thru the OPAC, and some are available only thru the Web page, and some are in both places.
- We follow AACR2/LCRIs for the cataloging of remote access electronic resources, using MARC21 as the structural markup. CONSER guidelines and the ISSN manual are also applicable for electronic serials.
- We adhere to national standards - AACR2, LC, OCLC, PCC - when cataloging all material, including e-resources. We do not have one local cataloging policy for remote electronic resources. Many policies and procedures affecting e-resources are managed by the Continuing Resources Policy Committee
<http://web.uflib.ufl.edu/serials/serpol.htm>. We participate in a statewide digitization program, referred to as PALMM <http://palmm.fcla.edu/>, and follow statewide guidelines for cataloging locally digitized material

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Majority of our records are handled by the California Digital Library Shared Cataloging Program. It has a detailed cataloging policy for record creation. Our in house cataloging policy is a very simple one.
- We are in the process of compiling one.
- Yes: Serials: <http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/cataloging/policies/e-ejour.shtml>
Monographs:
http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/cataloging/procedures/cataloging_electronic_monographs.shtml

2. Approximately what percent of the remote electronic resources cataloged by your library are serials? If more than one library gave the same number, the number of libraries is in parentheses after the number cataloged annually. If there is no number in parentheses, assume that only one library gave this figure.

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

1	30-35	66
3.2	33	75
10	36	80 (3)
11	37	85 (2)
16	50	89
25 (2)	50+	90
30 (3)	60 (2)	Most

- Extremely rough estimate, made more complicated by practice of added electronic information to print records when available.
- Specific percentage is not currently available.
- It varies greatly depending on what packages we buy each year.
- Serials percentage may increase in near future

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

5	25	85 (2)
8-10	50 (3)	90 (8)
10 (3)	75 (3)	95 (6)
12	76	98 (2)
20 (2)	80 (7)	100

3. Does your library produce a separate record for online titles, or does it use a "single" record to catalog both tangible and online versions of the same item?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
SINGLE	18	31
SEPARATE	6	17

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- In most cases we merely attach an 856 to the serial in question. This is done solely in the local database. However, for our LLMC Digital WorldCat Set, all records are e-records and created in OCLC. If all we hold is the electronic version for which we cannot provide ILL service, the library's holdings are NOT set in OCLC.
- Serials Solutions records are single, original cataloging are separate
- Both techniques are used
- Both single-record approach and separate-record approach are used; depends on situation
- We use a single record if we own a print or microformat version of the electronic title.
- We have both, depending on how access is provided and when.

- We produce single combined bib records for serials and for monographs when the library has the print version. We maintain separate print and electronic records in the OPAC for netLibrary books with no linking field between them
- Both methods are used. For example, e-journals are cataloged using the single record approach; netLibrary records are loaded as separate records.
- Single record, except for EBSCO titles, which use separate records for online version
- Normally, we use a single record if the contents are the same. If a publication is a multi-part or continuing resource (integrating resource or serial) and the format (paper, microfiche, online) in which we distribute it exclusively changes to another format (i.e., microfiche to paper), we create or adapt an additional record following the AACR2 rules for the format currently distributed.
- We use the single record approach when feasible.
- In the past we have used both, so our catalog reflects both practices. We are currently in the process of formulating a policy that will ensure a consistent cataloging treatment of electronic resources.
- For monographs and collections digitized from items in the LC collections (generally historic books, photographs, sound recordings, moving images, maps, etc.), LC policy is to add details regarding the digital manifestation to the record for the original item. Books currently being cataloged and added to the Library's collections that are also (freely) available remotely may also contain a link to the electronic manifestation on the record for the print. Although LC has followed both a "single record" and "multiple record" approach for serials in the past, a group is currently re-evaluating LC policies in this area. LC's intention to emphasize a single-record approach for serials during the next several years was announced at ALA Annual in Toronto.
- When we own the tangible version of a title, we do a "single" record for both. An exception to this is the batch loading of large sets, such as netLibrary. This results in separate records for tangible and electronic titles as there is no attempt to consolidate records from batch loads.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Both
- For serials we started using the single record approach: print, online, microform, etc., on the same record. Now we are canceling some paper & replacing with electronic, which makes us wonder about this approach (expedience drove the decision). For integrating resources we use separate records
- We use a single record for serials and a separate record for monographs
- We catalog serials (E- and hard copy) on single records, and monographs (E- and hard copy) on separate records, as per national standards and guidelines.
- Our early efforts at cataloging electronic serials followed the single record approach. However, as the number of electronic titles exploded and we began loading record sets from vendors, we moved to separate records. This greatly facilitates automated record replacement and deletion.

4. Does your library run a links checker against links?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	20	21
NO	10	25

If so, how often? If more than one library gave the same number, the number of libraries is in parentheses after the number cataloged annually. If there is no number in parentheses, assume that only one library gave this figure.

BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Weekly
- Every other week
- Monthly
- Every 2 months
- 3 times a year
- Quarterly
- Semi-annually
- Infrequently
- Rarely
- Very irregularly
- Weekly for PURLs; quarterly for PIDs
- Irregularly
- LC evaluates, on a monthly basis, the links present in records included in LC distribution products in the previous month. Discussions are ongoing related to expanding link checks
- We run a link checker in our Information Gateway Digital Registry, but not in our catalog. The link checker runs daily Monday-Friday over a certain percentage of the pages.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Responses:

- Weekly (4)
- Every 2 weeks
- Monthly (3)
- 3-4 times per year
- Quarterly (4)
- Semi-annually
- At least annually
- Annually (2)
- Whenever we have reason to think that an aggregation of titles has changed its URL.
- Not sure

- When we remember
- We're looking for one that works
- Undetermined

5. Does your library use open URLs?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	18	25
NO	13	19

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- If "use" means "assign," the answer is "no." If "use" means "include as URL in 856 field," the answer is "yes."
- Just beginning to implement with Serials Solutions data.
- Behind our PURLs, we are beginning to get many open URLs, but we don't use the latter directly.
- If this means OpenURLs, the answer is that LC is considering acquiring an OpenURL linkserver. However, "OpenURLs" have little to do with cataloging. If this means does LC use persistent identifiers for links to the digital resources it manages, the answer is yes and that LC runs a Handle Server (not a PURL Server) for this purpose.
- Not familiar with the term

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- I'm not sure if we use open URLs (not sure what that refers to).

6. Does your library use PURLs?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	24	27
NO	6	17

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Yes, GPO PURLs
- If "use" means "assign", the answer is "no". If "use" means "include as URL in 856 field", the answer is "yes" (same comment for supplemental questions 5 and 6)
- No, except for those records we receive from Marcive for federal government publications which contain PURLs.
- LC incorporates records with PURLs as part of copy cataloging (e.g., importing records for federal documents with PURLs assigned by GPO), and also those cooperatively assigned by CONSER participants; however, LC does not actively assign PURLs.

- We now use PURL-like URLs for Documenting the American South (having been burned with two server name changes), with the project's server maintaining the links to the real URLs.
- If a PURL is in the record we're using for cataloging, yes.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- I think that we actually may use some PURLs here at the Univ. of Nebraska-Lincoln. Some of the gov docs use PURLs, I believe.

7. Does your library routinely review any of the remote electronic resources you have cataloged to see if the record created still reflects the item cataloged, e.g. to catch a change in title, subject matter, or focus?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	8	14
NO	23	33

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Generally, no. For Documenting the American South titles, we do go back and add new things to the records if more is added at the website (e.g., summaries or supporting material).
- We check serials that are currently active at least once a year, but not monographs or integrating resources.
- No routine review is currently performed, a policy regarding such a practice is currently under development.
- No, changes are found if the link is broken or changed. Broken links are found by the link checker, public services staff, and patrons. If no new URL is reported, the cataloger will search for the site and compare the existing catalog record to the current site. Some changes are found if the site is used by a cataloger.
- No, unless brought to our attention.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- We use a URL checker, and at that point we check sites and correct records, but we don't tend to look at sites otherwise, though sometimes it's incidental that we'll see a record for a site that needs updating.
- No, not yet, but we shall do it in the future.

8. If your library provides access to electronic resources in ways other than cataloging records in your local system (website, commercial portal, etc.), is there subject access given to titles in alternative listings?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	19	18
NO	4	22

If so, what sort of subject access?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
LCSH	4	4
OTHER STANDARD LIST	4	3
LOCAL LIST	21	14

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Also, we use 050 to sort titles into broad subject categories
- MeSH
- The answer is really "all three": General article databases, indexes, ejournals, etc., at the website get only general headings based on a short fixed locally-developed list based on the curriculum categories. For Documenting the American South (DAS), the LC Subject Headings are extracted from the MARC records and added to the web pages for each text; the DAS project's subject index is a searchable list of these subject headings. The LCSH headings are also chopped up, de-duped, and added as "meta-keywords" to the HTML files for each text. Subject headings from LC's Thesaurus for Graphic Materials are assigned to images at the site and these too are searchable as a separate database.
- LCSH
- LCSH for searching; locally developed list for browsing
- Very broad subject descriptors
- Broad subject categories like Business & Economy, Government, etc.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- In one portal, MeSH; in another portal, alphabetical order of title
- VERY BROAD SUBJECT ACCESS for electronic databases at our website
- brief Dewey
- Based mostly on disciplines or large geographic areas (funds)

9. Is your cataloging staff routinely involved in creating non-MARC metadata for electronic resources?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	7	5
NO	23	31

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- We are planning to have catalogers involved in this for the future and should begin very shortly.
- Cataloging staff is involved in consulting, not yet in metadata creation
- No. For Documenting the American South (DAS), catalogers review TEI Headers while creating the MARC records (and provide feedback to DAS project staff if they will conflict with the MARC records), but both the Headers and Dublin Core records created for the Open Archives Initiative are produced by DAS project staff, not catalogers.
- Some staff are involved in an advisory capacity and in special projects.
- Reference and serials cataloging staff create records for our local electronic resources database. Otherwise, cataloging staff create non-MARC metadata only for those electronic resources published by the library.
- Not collectively, but Cataloging Staff serving on project teams do (e.g., the Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team (BEAT) members are involved in creating the scanned TOC and ONIX projects data in non-MARC format, see: <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/beat/>. The MINERVA Team is creating MODS records for archived collections, see: <http://www.loc.gov/minerva/>
- No. The role of the Cataloging Department is to establish policies and guidelines for collection providers, and offer training. The collection owners create the metadata for their collections.
- Yes, although we are just beginning to involve cataloging staff. Up to now, non-MARC metadata for e-resources has been handled by specialized staff with responsibility for investigating and applying appropriate metadata for e-resource collections.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- We are getting more into Dublin Core and that sort of thing, but it's not a main activity at this point. I sense that we will be getting into non-MARC data creation in the near future.

10. Does your library have a collection development policy specifically for electronic resources?

	BIBCO /CONSER	NON- BIBCO /CONSER
YES	10	23
NO	17	23

BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- Only the free e-resources
- We have electronic resource cataloging procedure documents but not policies
- No--incorporated into individual (subject) collection development policies
- In draft form (bibliographers found developing a policy to be much tougher sledding than originally expected!)
- While the selection committees have general guidelines governing what they selected, there does not seem to be an actual formal written policy
- No. E-resources are selected using the same criteria as materials in other formats.
- Yes. SOD 71/72 is part of these.
- Yes, several policies for various categories of electronic resources. See: <http://www.lib.umd.edu/CLMD/colbuilding.html#policy>
- Not really, but we spend lots of time grappling with these issues
- See <http://www.lib.washington.edu/msd/internetseguide.html>

Non-BIBCO/CONSER Comments:

- I would have preferred to say, "yes and no" because the E-resource collection development policy is tacked onto the basic coll dev policy, and just covers the possibility of licensing agreements.
- Networked Electronic Publications Policy and Guidelines to be found on National Library of Canada Website at: <http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/9/8/index-e.html>
- Formal collection policy statements for electronic resources exist: See <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/electron.html> for general guidelines, <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/geodata.html> for information specific to geospatial data, and <http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/devpol/webarchive.html> for information related to the selection of archived Web resources and some projects provide additional criteria or other selection assistance (see <http://lcweb.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/beonsel.html> for BEOnline project selection criteria and supplementary guides for selectors at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/rr/business/beonline/questions.html>) It should be noted that the selection guidelines for electronic resources are currently being re-evaluated by staff and contractors of the Library.
- The policy is online at http://www.libraries.rutgers.edu/rul/staff/tech_serv/policies/draft_principles.shtml

General Comments:

BIBCO/CONSER:

- We process a variety of record loads annually. Examples include netLibrary, Early English Books Online, and GPO. We add links to records for e-resource journals as well as other material. As of 9/30/03, we had 116,897 links in our library catalog.
- For a number of years, Congress has required GPO to continue to reduce the number of tangible documents it provides to depositories and to increase the public availability of the online versions of documents by creating cataloging records for them that link to them. Our cataloging of titles continues to expand and now accounts for at least 65% of cataloging activities. Revisions to AACR2, the LCRIs, and other international and national standards, such as CONSER Editing Guide have been very helpful to our cataloging operations. GPO catalogers are increasingly involved in all aspects of the precataloging processes, including selection, SuDOCs classification, pre-cataloging record keeping, and other processes.
- The Library of Congress is a large international institution composed of many units. Different divisions throughout our many units follow a variety of policies, standards and practices based on the format of the material that is being processed. To complete this survey, responses were collected from various units throughout this institution.

Non-BIBCO/CONSER:

- My greatest concern is lack of uniform way to keep up with different iterations of databases and e-journals in "OCLC"
- Note that my remarks on MARC cataloging have to do almost exclusively with electronic journals, which currently is almost the only type of electronic resource we put in the OPAC. Our portals however do link to other types of resource, principally websites and databases. We are holding a meeting of interested parties however in the near future with a view to expanding the coverage of types within the OPAC.
- Several of the questions asked have more than yes or no answers, mainly due to the fact that this is a fairly new field for us.
- Collection development and cataloging practices for e-resources are being written. What we do now is mainly download OCLC records, with few original cataloging needed.
- I can't get at the statistics for last year because we're moving and they're packed. Sorry. We're planning to add full records to our catalog for electronic serials where we have subscriptions to JSTOR, Project Muse and Blackwell Synergy, but we're in a consortium catalog, and not all members subscribe, and we still have issues to work out. We're also planning to add bibliographic records to the catalog for websites that are listed in the subject access portions of our library's website that have been selected by the subject specialists.
- Just a note: It took five people from the Cataloging and Acquisitions departments to complete this survey. RUL engages in an immersive electronic environment in

which all our work includes both analog and electronic resources. We do not have a separate electronic resources cataloging unit, nor do we have selectors who solely select e-resources. We also do not routinely collect statistics based solely on the electronic/analog format of the title, unless it is specifically cataloged on the MRDF/Computer Files/Electronic Resources (or whatever!) format. No Cataloger Left Behind!! No Librarian Left Behind!!